

REMARKS

Claims 17-26 and 32 are currently pending. Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-16 and 27-31. In addition, Applicants have amended Claim 24 and added new Claim 32.

The Examiner has identified in the application the following patentably distinct inventions:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a motorcycle, classified in class 180, subclass 219;
- II. Claims 9-16, drawn to an electronic device, classified in class 174, subclass 50;
- III. Claims 17-23, drawn to a mounting system, classified in class 248, subclass 200;
- IV. Claims 24-26, drawn to a method of detaching a device, classified in class 29, subclass 426.1; and
- V. Claims 27-31, drawn to a method of mounting a device, classified in class 29, subclass 700.

The Examiner has required election of one of the inventions for prosecution.

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required. *See M.P.E.P. 803*. The Applicants respectfully assert that examination of the claims of Groups III and IV can be made without serious burden on the Examiner.

Group III and Group IV are related as product (Group III) and process of use (Group IV). The product is directed to a break-away mounting system for mounting an electronic device to a motorcycle. The mounting system includes a first bracket that is connectable to the motorcycle and a second bracket connectable to the electronic device and detachably connected to the first bracket. The process for using the product is found in Claim 24, which defines a method of detaching an electronic device from a motorcycle. The method includes, among other things, connecting a first bracket to the motorcycle, detachably connecting a second bracket to the first bracket, and connecting an electronic device to the second bracket. Applicants have amended Claim 24 to remove the limitation that required attachment to a riser. As such, the product and the process recite a first bracket that is connectable to a motorcycle and a step of connecting a first bracket to a motorcycle. Thus, the product as claimed is not used in a materially different process.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that maintaining Groups III and IV in the present application does not present a serious burden on the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Applicants hereby request withdrawal of the restriction requirement, particularly with respect to Groups III and IV, and examination of Claims 17-26 and 32. If the restriction is upheld, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute, with traverse, the invention of Group III including Claims 17-23.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'TH J Otterlee', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Thomas J. Otterlee
Reg. No. 48,652

Docket No.: 043210-1428-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560